ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 5/23/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED000184	8022	N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S):
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
The College and University in International Affairs

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Carnegie Foundation
ST. 589 Fifth Avenue
CITY, STATE New York 17, N.Y.
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	6C	15

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR Conference

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

higher education	programs	government	
foreign education	graduate education		
foreign students	undergraduate education		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

An informal account of an all-day discussion of American higher education in international affairs by the trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The publication reviews accomplishments and limitations in areas of undergraduate and graduate programs in international affairs and identifies some steps which might be taken to increase the effectiveness of the education of foreign students on American campuses and to improve international scholarly communication. It also contrasts points of view regarding the responsibilities of the university in international matters and government-university relationships on overseas contracts.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT
Reporter No. 6

C. FUNDING DATA N.A.

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

#5 R-6-1
x 5 (international studies)
12
21
Return To Celia Richards
For Reporter 6 Files
HE8022
8022
ED000184

The College and University in International Affairs

Summary of a Discussion

by the Trustees

of the Carnegie Foundation for

the Advancement of Teaching

(reprinted from the 1959-1960 Annual Report)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

The College and University in International Affairs

At the 54th annual meeting of the Foundation on November 18, 1959, the trustees engaged in an all-day discussion of American higher education in international affairs. The essay which follows constitutes a summary of the discussion which took place that day. Obviously a brief summary must limit itself to the central themes and cannot possibly do justice to all of the views presented.

There was no attempt to arrive at a consensus on every point. Accordingly, the following statement is not presented as the views of the trustees of the Foundation, nor even as the views of all those present. It is simply an informal account of a discussion of an important issue in higher education today.

In addition to the officers of the Foundation, the following trustees were present during the discussion: Mr. Branscomb, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Gould, Mr. Griswold, Mr. Harris, Mr. Houston, Mr. Hovde, Mr. Kimpton, Mr. Kirk, Mr. Lamont, Mr. MacKenzie, Miss McBride, Mrs. McIntosh, Mr. Millis, Dr. Murphy, Mr. Pusey, Mr. Wells, Mr. Logan Wilson and Mr. O. Meredith Wilson.

The College and University in International Affairs

The perils and dilemmas of international affairs overshadow every other problem we face as a nation. What are the colleges and universities doing—and what should they be doing—on this most important of all fronts?

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

What Every Student Needs to Know

American colleges and universities are giving the student more and better instruction on international affairs than at any time in the past. Even so, they have not kept pace with the urgent need for such instruction, and the many courses available in any good institution reach only a fraction of the student body. The numerous courses make quite a splash in the college catalog but no splash at all in the lives of most students.

There is no simple solution. The curriculum is crowded, and students find it hard to get around to everything they need to know. There is less and less likelihood that the general run of students will find time to take special courses in international affairs. If the great majority are to be reached they must be reached through the general education courses (e.g., Western Civilization) that many colleges require of all students, or through the introductory social science courses that have fairly heavy enrollments. A good deal of what the student needs to know about international affairs could be (but is not usually) introduced into these courses.

Of course, professors cannot spend more time teaching the international aspects of their subject without spending less time on something else. This limits the possibilities. But if the colleges and universities are to do an

adequate job of acquainting the undergraduate with international affairs, a greater share of both student and faculty time will have to be allotted to this purpose. That may mean that something else is crowded out. It should be reckoned as part of the price of living in a world that is under the shadow of catastrophe.

Colleges and universities that offer a broad liberal arts education do an effective job of introducing the student to European civilization. But until recently they have done poorly in introducing the student to the world outside Western Europe and the United States. This has led to a movement, pioneered by Columbia University and others, to offer more adequate instruction on these lesser known areas.

It has been a difficult task. Adequate source materials were extremely difficult to find. The professor teaching a course in Western Civilization has available a rich variety of primary and secondary sources in translation. Until recently the professor teaching Oriental studies could count on very little in the way of teaching materials.

That lack is now being remedied. Thanks to excellent work at Columbia University, the University of Chicago, and other leading institutions, not only are extremely useful source materials coming out, but useful models are available of how to organize courses on these less familiar areas.

We are moving rapidly toward a situation in which one or more courses on non-Western civilization will be regarded as an essential part of a liberal arts curriculum. Although not every student will take such courses, they will be available in an increasing number of institutions.

Majors in International Studies

Some students will want to specialize in international affairs. Most colleges and universities offer one or more major programs in this field. Perhaps the most common major is the one labeled International Relations. Some colleges also offer undergraduate majors in foreign area studies (e.g., Chinese studies, Russian studies).

Aside from those majors which are explicitly international, it is possible in most good institutions to major in one of the social sciences with a strong international emphasis. Indeed such a major is often the most effective means of approaching the international field.

Foreign Languages

The most obvious reason to study a foreign language is to gain fluency in it. Thanks to modern methods, the language departments can now help their students to achieve this goal more effectively than ever before. A good many departments are still stubbornly resisting the new methods—but modern language laboratories and the modern approach to language teaching are well on the way to full-scale triumph.

A less obvious reason for studying a foreign language is to learn something about the nature of language itself. If the language departments are willing to expose themselves not just to modern language teaching methods but to the science of linguistics which spawned those methods, they may also accomplish this second goal: they may teach in such a way as to shed light on the nature of linguistic communication. A significant by-product of this might be improvement of the student's effectiveness in English!

A third—and vitally important—reason for studying a foreign language is to learn something about another culture. Language study can serve as a significant means of introducing the student not only to the language itself but to the society which speaks that language. Unfortunately, most language teachers today receive such a narrow education that they would not be competent to introduce students to another society.

Events of recent years have provided an enormous stimulus to the teaching and learning of the less familiar languages. The most dramatic results have been achieved with Russian. Five years ago not more than a handful of secondary schools taught Russian; today about 500 do so. Russian language courses at the college level have attracted not only large numbers but many of the abler students. Able students have no great trouble in mastering it at the undergraduate level—though it does take a good deal of time.

We can boast no such achievement in the case of Chinese—the next most important of the less familiar languages. There are still relatively few American students studying Chinese at the college level. How we shall get more of them to do so remains a question. There is an even smaller number studying the other great but less familiar languages—Arabic, Japanese, Urdu, and so forth.

In terms of importance to our own future, Russian and Chinese are in a class by themselves. As rapidly as possible we should remove them from the category of "rare languages." We should aim to place Russian on a par with French in high school and college enrollments. In the case of Chinese, we should create several strong secondary school programs in metropolitan centers near universities which specialize in Chinese studies. And there should be many universities in which Chinese is regularly offered and is elected by a fair number of students. Only in this way can we assure an adequate flow of individuals fluent in this important language.

As for the other world languages, no such extensive efforts are required. In each case we must insure a steady but modest supply of individuals who have command of the language. And this must be done primarily at the university level—perhaps chiefly at the graduate level.

Extracurricular Activities

Most colleges have some sort of extracurricular activity relating to foreign affairs. The international relations clubs which exist on many campuses are one such activity. Foreign language departments frequently have clubs and even living quarters. There are often activities centering around foreign students.

Such extracurricular activities are useful in stimulating interest and in enabling the student to escape the bookish approach to international affairs which must necessarily dominate the curriculum. But too often such activities have a rather sentimental quality. They tend to further the notion that international relations are chiefly a matter of goodwill and emotional commitment. This is not true, and it is not the approach which will attract the abler student. International relations as a field of study is a serious and exacting business, not an emotional outlet. Only intensive study will produce the high professional competence which the field requires. Extracurricular activities should in some measure reflect an awareness of this fact.

Undergraduate Overseas Study

Every year many thousands of American students travel outside this country. But though such travel offers an incomparable opportunity for serious study, very few young people undertake such study. Of the few

who do, only a tiny fraction are engaged in anything of first quality, academically speaking. Considering that there have been overseas study programs in existence for many years, it is notable how little prestige they have achieved on American campuses. Most professors do not take them seriously, and most students approach them in the same spirit.

All of this is changing. It is beginning to dawn on people, even the happy tourists, that the rest of the world is not out there simply as a playground for traveling Americans. Many young people today want seriously to learn something about the rest of the world. And we are beginning to see the development of a number of overseas programs of excellent academic quality.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

It is at the graduate level that the universities have done their most impressive work in international studies. In our leading institutions there is a substantial quantity of good basic research work on international matters. And it is possible to take the Ph.D. in any of several social science fields with very strong emphasis on the international aspects of the field. In addition, following World War II, many universities established programs of research and teaching on one or another foreign area. Since a program in any one area involves a rather heavy investment, each university has tended to specialize, but among them they cover every area of the world.

At the graduate level the university has two distinguishable educational functions: (1) it must prepare future college teachers and research people, and (2) it must prepare those who are going into the foreign service or other international careers. Its effectiveness in accomplishing the latter purpose has been a matter of debate.

Some say that we shall never do an adequate job of training American representatives to serve abroad until we establish a foreign service academy along the lines of West Point and Annapolis. Most college and university presidents strongly oppose this view. They argue that no academy could duplicate—without enormous expense—the faculty and library resources already available in any number of major universities. They also argue that segregating future foreign service officers is not in the best interest of the nation nor of the officers themselves.

These arguments bear particularly upon the idea of an undergraduate academy. There is less objection to a graduate academy, although a good many educational leaders resist this idea too. They point out that many universities have graduate programs quite capable of accomplishing the desired objectives. This may be true, but if the universities were doing all that needed to be done in the career training of Americans for overseas work, the idea of a foreign service academy would not keep cropping up. The truth is that most universities which have the resources to accomplish such training do not give it the highest priority. At the graduate level, they give first priority to the education of those who are seeking the Ph.D. The requirements of the individual who is preparing for a life of action as a foreign service officer are rarely put at the top of the priority list in a leading university.

It would be most unfair, however, to blame the universities for our failure to provide adequate career training for overseas service. The government agencies which should be most deeply concerned with recruitment and training for such careers have been negligent in the whole matter. Almost every other field which employs educated talent has long since realized that it must act wisely and vigorously to insure an adequate supply of well-trained recruits. Government agencies have never done this with respect to our representatives overseas. What is needed is not a foreign service academy but collaboration between universities and government on a long-term plan for recruitment and training of a certain number of our ablest young people for overseas careers.

FOREIGN STUDENTS ON AMERICAN CAMPUSES

In the academic year 1959–60 there were more than 48,000 foreign students on American campuses. The needs of the underdeveloped countries are such that there may be great pressure to increase that number. At the same time, overcrowding on American campuses may lead some institutions to consider limiting the number of foreign students. How these two pressures will balance out, no one knows.

The presence of many foreign students on our campuses provides us with a great opportunity to help the students themselves, the nations from which

they come, and the cause of international amity. But the hazards are also great. The foreign student does not always have a satisfactory experience here. If we hope to do well with foreign students, the following considerations should be weighed.

1. No agency or institution, American or foreign, should send foreign students to the United States without careful planning. There can be no assurance that anything beneficial will come of it unless it is intelligently done. We should not necessarily seek to bring *more* foreign students to these shores. We should seek to do a better job with those who come.

2. Students coming to this country should be carefully selected at the point of origin. It is unfair to the student to send him here if he is incompetent to carry through the educational program he thinks he wants, or is wholly unprepared for the experience in other ways.

3. Foreign students should be intelligently advised, so that they end up in the institution that is right for them, in a program that fills their needs.

4. Every college or university which receives foreign students should help them to adjust to their new environment. Many campuses have appointed foreign student advisers, but most of these advisers are overworked and cannot possibly do all that they might wish.

5. No institution should bring foreign students here if the program is likely to serve simply as a device for importing talent from the foreign country involved. All too often young people come here, get an American education and decide to stay. This is unfortunate, since their own land often desperately needs their talent.

6. Foreign nations sending students here should work out effective means of using the talents of these individuals on their return.

Recently some universities have been trying to establish closer ties with their foreign student alumni. There are unexploited possibilities here for maintaining a mutually constructive tie between the university and the student who has returned to his own country. The university should find it useful to maintain a network of such individuals throughout the world.

The recent action of the USSR in creating a special university for foreign students has led to much comment in this country. Some observers believe that in doing this the Russians have again set an example of bold and effective action to win world support. But the project has already encountered severe difficulties. And the truth is that our method of dispersing foreign students throughout all our colleges and universities is very much more

bold. It can also be more effective, provided that we address ourselves seriously to the considerations listed above.

INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

Since the Middle Ages (with a few lapses) the world of universities has been a world without international boundaries. Scholars have moved from country to country, finding themselves at home with their fellow scholars wherever they met them. It is an old tradition and a great one. Most professors believe that communication of scholars across international boundaries is not only essential to the advancement of knowledge but one of the most hopeful means of advancing international harmony. This is an article of faith almost universally held.

In view of this deep conviction, it is startling to discover how casual and ineffective most international scholarly communication is. Journals are probably the most effective means of communication today. Exchange professorships are still too rare. International conferences are usually poorly managed, overburdened with set speeches, paralyzed by language barriers, and confusing to the participants.

The United States is often handicapped at such conferences by the fact that its delegation is the only one without government financial support. The consequence—all too frequently—is that where other delegations are represented by the ablest men available, the United States is represented by someone who simply happens to be traveling in the country where the meeting is taking place. This saves his sponsors the burden of paying travel costs—and often results in poor representation.

Fortunately, there is a new interest in international scholarly communication, and it may bring some significant improvements in the process.

Among the various types of international scholarly collaboration, one must mention the relationships which occasionally spring up between an American university and a foreign university. Under proper circumstances they offer an interesting opportunity for a "laboratory" experience on the part of students from both campuses and provide an organizational framework in which a growing network of communication can develop. The new relationship between the University of Kansas and the University of Costa

Rica, and the 25-year-old exchange between Union College and St. Andrews in Scotland, are examples of what can be accomplished along these lines.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNIVERSITY

Not even within the academic world is there full agreement as to the scope of the university's responsibilities in international matters. This lack of clarity is still more noticeable outside the academic world.

For example, when a Washington official discusses education on international affairs with a professor, he is almost certain, sooner or later, to say: "All these high-flown programs are fine, but what are you doing to educate the great American public?"

The answer is "Very little, directly," and properly so. Although colleges and universities reach substantial numbers of adults through their extension programs, they are not well equipped to conduct really broad programs of public education.

But they have an immensely important *indirect* role in educating the public. It is the task of the university to *teach the people who will educate the public.* The public is "taught" by editors, radio and TV commentators, magazine writers, writers of popular books, public school teachers, lecturers, clergymen, public officials, and community leaders. Almost all of these are college educated. If the college has done its work well, they will do a good job of educating the public.

The colleges and universities have a second job to do: they must produce the research and the resource material on which *all* education on international matters—academic or popular—must be based. The individual engaged in popular education, whether he is a magazine writer or a lecturer, probably has read the major university-produced books on the subject.

In short, the role of the university is very important—but it is one step removed from the broad public audience. And the university cannot strengthen its contribution by trying to make that role more direct. It must stick to its last.

Among the most controversial of the universities' activities in the international field have been the numerous overseas services they have performed under contract to our government—helping underdeveloped areas to plan

their economic growth, strengthening foreign universities, assisting new nations to develop modern administrative procedures, and so on.

Are the universities doing these things because it is an authentic part of their responsibility to do them? Or are they doing them just to be cooperative? Or because they can't resist a share in current excitements? Is it the business of an American university to help an Asian nation reform its police administration? Should the universities assist our government in its program of economic and technical aid to underdeveloped countries?

There is no unanimity in the academic world on these questions.

One may explore the responsibility of the universities at several levels. One may ask, "How wide is the responsibility of a university?" Are the responsibilities of a state university limited by the boundaries of the state? Is the responsibility of a private university to be defined in terms of its visible constituencies—students, alumni, board members, parents, the surrounding community?

The answer to both questions is "no." Our private and public universities have long since established the principle that their responsibilities cannot be defined in terms of their immediate constituencies. Many of our private institutions are conducting programs which are explicable *only* in terms of their value to the nation or to mankind. Similarly our leading public institutions have long since moved beyond the set of responsibilities defined by their tax base. Virtually all our great state institutions are performing services which can be explained only as services to the nation as a whole.

The principle is a fundamental one. Once a university is set into operation, its responsibilities are defined by academic tradition, by the nature of the intellectual enterprise, and by the broadest conception of the needs of society at large and mankind generally.

There are critics, however, who would say, "We agree that the university's responsibility is not defined by its local constituency, but its responsibility is not limitless. Specifically, it is not the university's job to help the government get its business done."

The soundness of this assertion is highly debatable. In our system, the government has never had a monopoly on public purpose. A non-governmental institution has a right—in some cases a responsibility—to contribute

to public purposes. The fate of free institutions and free societies in the world at large is a matter of grave and immediate interest to the universities. Our system permits them to act in support of that interest. It would be a tragic mistake to suppose that only the federal government could contribute to such national goals, that only public institutions could concern themselves with such public purposes.

As a matter of fact, the universities have already given a very effective demonstration of how our system can work to the good of the nation. After World War II nothing could have been more genuinely a matter for national concern than training people in the field of international affairs. The federal government should have been actively interested—but this was an issue on which it was sound asleep. The universities—public and private—were not asleep. The government has finally awakened and is actively interested in the subject, but 99 per cent of the accomplishments and achievements in this field today stem from activity initiated years ago outside the federal government.

Among those who resist heavy involvement of the university in overseas contracts, many believe that the university simply has not the resources to perform every chore that requires expert knowledge. Their concern is not that the university will go beyond some theoretical definition of its function, but that it will destroy its usefulness by trying to do too many things on too many fronts.

But others argue that if the universities do not undertake the overseas assignments, the government will simply have to create new institutions to perform these functions. This is not an attractive possibility.

The argument has still other facets. Some heartily agree that the universities cannot hold themselves aloof from the great issues of the day, but believe that the universities' involvement should be wholly at the level of teaching and research. In contrast, there is the view strongly held by the land grant institutions that the university is a service agency committed to contribute to society not only through teaching and research but through the performance of many practical tasks which involve a high level of expertness. The land grant institutions have a long and honorable tradition of such service at the state level, and they see no difficulty in extending the principle to the national and international spheres.

The proponents of these opposing views are not in bitter conflict, but they have a genuine difference of opinion. And the difference may never be resolved. At bottom, it stems from differing views of the university as a social institution. There is no reason why we should demand a showdown between these views. If Yale chooses to make its contribution to international affairs in one way, and Purdue in quite another way, nothing but good can come of allowing each to act in terms of its own tradition.

RELATION OF THE UNIVERSITIES TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A good many university leaders believe that in performing overseas tasks for the government, the university too often accepts a role it would not think of accepting at home. At home the university is very sensitive to outside control, even more sensitive to any pressure to "sell" a particular point of view. Yet overseas it often gets itself into the position of meekly doing what it is told, and of selling whatever point of view our government favors at the moment. Few academic leaders can accept this as a sound role for the university.

The university can be effective only when it is being true to itself. Operating within this relatively limited role, the university can be extremely useful overseas. Foreign universities and governments value the freedom, integrity and objectivity of the American university, and its lack of subservience to official policy. These are assets we should not throw away.

The government can make effective use of the universities if it understands these things.

Some American university presidents, disturbed by the large commitments the university seems to be accepting all over the world, have proposed that the federal government deal directly with faculty members as individuals, retaining their services where necessary without involving the university as an institution. This is often done, and will continue to be common practice. But it will never advance to the point where the universities are free of major responsibilities. Foreign governments often prefer to deal with universities rather than with the United States Government or with individuals. Furthermore, American academic people working overseas

usually prefer to operate as representatives of their university rather than as individuals or as government employees.

Academic leaders should give attention to the effect of overseas contracts on the university itself, and should devise ways of working which will strengthen rather than weaken the university when they undertake such activities. The university is not just a reservoir of high talent manpower to be drawn on by government. It has important business of its own. Overseas programs can strengthen the capacity of the university to accomplish its own purposes—but only under wise management. The university should expect that any overseas operation should leave some residue in improvement of the curriculum, in better informed students, in more stimulating professors, in some new campus program, or in any of a number of other ways.

Some academic leaders argue that every overseas contract of the federal government should contain a certain amount of money which the university may use to strengthen itself as an institution for dealing with problems of this nature. The university could well use such funds, for example, in a long-term plan to solve the grave shortage of highly trained personnel for overseas service.

Some of the difficulty in government-university relationships on overseas contracts has stemmed from the absence of adequate university representation in Washington. This is not said in criticism of the various higher educational associations that have been active in Washington. They have done their job well. But the need has outstripped the present arrangements for university representation.

The government's requirements for assistance from the universities will continue. Large sums—larger than in the past—will be appropriated. In the absence of effective representation from the universities, people who do not know the university world will write the legislation governing the distribution of these funds. Without such representation, the interests, needs and capacities of the universities will not be reflected in the programs, and the programs will be managed by people who have no real conception of how they can most effectively work with the universities to serve the national need. Both in their own interest and in the national interest, the universities must learn to help shape the forces which impinge on them so strongly.

TRUSTEES AND OFFICERS OF ADMINISTRATION
1959–1960

Trustees

CARTER DAVIDSON, *President, Union College*, Chairman
WILLIAM V. HOUSTON, *President, Rice Institute*, Vice Chairman
HARVIE BRANSCOMB, *Chancellor, Vanderbilt University*
ARTHUR H. DEAN, *Sullivan & Cromwell*
JOHN W. GARDNER, *President, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*
ROBERT F. GOHEEN, *President, Princeton University*
LAURENCE M. GOULD, *President, Carleton College*
A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD, *President, Yale University*
RUFUS C. HARRIS, *President, Mercer University*
FREDERICK L. HOVDE, *President, Purdue University*
CLARK KERR, *President, University of California*
LAWRENCE A. KIMPTON, *Chancellor, University of Chicago*
GRAYSON L. KIRK, *President, Columbia University*
THOMAS S. LAMONT, *Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York*
ROBERT A. LOVETT, *Brown Brothers Harriman & Co.*
HOWARD F. LOWRY, *President, College of Wooster*
N. A. M. MACKENZIE, *President, University of British Columbia*
KATHARINE E. MCBRIDE, *President, Bryn Mawr College*
MILLICENT C. MCINTOSH, *President, Barnard College*
JOHN S. MILLIS, *President, Western Reserve University*
FRANKLIN D. MURPHY, *Chancellor, University of California*
NATHAN M. PUSEY, *President, Harvard University*
HERMAN B WELLS, *President, Indiana University*
LOGAN WILSON, *Chancellor, University of Texas*
O. MEREDITH WILSON, *President, University of Minnesota*

Executive Committee

JOHN W. GARDNER, Chairman
ARTHUR H. DEAN
WILLIAM V. HOUSTON
GRAYSON L. KIRK
MILLICENT C. MCINTOSH
FRANKLIN D. MURPHY
HERMAN B WELLS

Investment Committee

THOMAS S. LAMONT, Chairman
ARTHUR H. DEAN
ROBERT A. LOVETT

Officers of Administration

JOHN W. GARDNER, President
JAMES A. PERKINS, Vice President
FLORENCE ANDERSON, Secretary
C. HERBERT LEE, Treasurer
EDWARD A. ACKERMAN, Assistant Secretary